

Remarks

Claims 1-19 are pending.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, there was lack of antecedent basis for the term 'the window,' and there was a typographical error of the word 'may' instead of 'made.' These have been corrected by amendment to the claims above. It is submitted that these amendments overcome this rejection and withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Cook et al. (US Patent No. 5,727,950).

Cook is directed to an on-line learning system in which a student is instructed on core curriculum subjects, such as math, reading, etc., through a customizable user interface. The customizable user interface, the 'agent' of Cook, is generic in that all the users see the same interface until the user begins to use the system, at which point the interface may change depending upon the interaction. The student interacts with the agent to learn or practice topics in core curriculum subject areas. See Cook, col. 10, line 59 through col. 11, line 5 with regard to materials and tools, and col. 48, line 68 through col. 49, line 20 with regard to the instructional subjects.

Further, the evaluation provided by Cook is with regard to the subject matter, not the software application. The 'materials' referred to in the text referenced by the office action are the subject matter materials referred to above. The tools are optional items provided to the student but not necessarily used in the interaction.

In contrast, the invention as claimed is directed to a learning system to teach use of software applications, such as word processors, spreadsheets, etc. The generic user interface

does not change, it is generic in that it contains several elements common to software packages of a particular type.

Further, the tools provided by the system as claimed are the applications, such as the word processor, spreadsheet, etc. The student is required to use the tools and it is on the use of the tools that the student is evaluated, as well as the tools being the basis of the interaction with the system.

Finally, the evaluation presented is related to the student's performance with regard to the use of the software application. The evaluation may also include the performance with regard to the subject matter, but the evaluation is also about the student's performance with regard to the tools.

Claims 1, 14, 16 and 17 have been amended to more clearly show that the user interface has elements common to several different software packages of a particular type of application. This is supported in the specification on page 4, line 19, through page 5, line 8, among other places.

As discussed above, the prior art does not provide this type of generic user interface. It is therefore submitted that claims 1, 14, 16 and 17 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 8 and 19 have been amended to more clearly show that the tools used in the system are the source of the student's interaction with the system, not optional item provided for the student's convenience. As discussed above, this is not shown, taught nor suggested by the prior art. It is therefore submitted that claims 8 and 19 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, claims 9-13 depend from claim 8, claim 15 depends from 14, and claim 18 depends from claim 17. These claims inherently contain all of the limitations of their respective base claims. As discussed above, the prior art does not teach,

show nor suggest all of the limitations of the base claims, much less the further embodiments of the dependent claims.

It is therefore submitted that claims 2-7, 9-13, 15 and 18 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and allowance of these claims is requested.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed is not considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Conclusion

No new matter has been added by this amendment. Allowance of all claims is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing the case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.

Julie L. Reed

Julie L. Reed
Reg. No. 35,349

Customer No. 20575
MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
1030 SW Morrison Street
Portland, OR 97205
(503) 222-3613